



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,606	01/30/2001	Roland L. Fernandez	MS164006.1	1724
27195	7590	10/11/2005	EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/772,606

Applicant(s)

FERNANDEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

PT

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 7/6/05.
2. Claims 1-45 are pending in this application; and, claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 22, 42 and 44 are independent claims. Claims 1-17, 21-23 and 26-45 have been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 16-21 are objected to because of the following informalities: "multiplicand for" of line 5 of claim 16 appears to contain a grammatical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1 – 8 and 42 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isreal ("Isreal") in view of Simons et al. ("Simons"), and further in view of Marflak et al. ("Marflak").

Claim 1:

Isreal teaches a system adapted to size a user interface (UI) element having at least one component that responds to a sizing input (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches a sizing module adapted to size a first component in response to the sizing

Art Unit: 2174

input (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches an alignment module adapted to align a second component within the sized first component (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Israel does not explicitly disclose mitigating pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component. Simons teaches mitigating pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of mitigating pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component in a system adapted to size a UI element having at least one component that responds to a sizing input to Isreal's teaching of a system adapted to size a UI element having at least one component that responds to a sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Isreal and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Isreal and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to

Art Unit: 2174

mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 2:

The modified Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (Isreal: fig. 15). Labels used for naming the various windows are also UI themes.

Claim 3:

The modified Isreal teaches the first component being a bitmap and the sizing module being adapted to divide the bitmap into a plurality of grids and adjust margins of at least some of the grids to size at least some of the grids of the bitmap (Isreal: col. 7, lines 25 – 35).

Claim 4:

Isreal teaches a UI element having at least one component in response to a sizing input (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches receiving the sizing input (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches dividing a bitmapped first component into a plurality of grids (col. 7, lines 25 – 35). Isreal teaches adjusting the margins of at least some of the grids to size at least some of the grids of the bitmap in response to the sizing input (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). Isreal teaches aligning a second component within the first sized component (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). Israel does not explicitly disclose mitigating pixilation and inconsonant appearance of a UI element. Simons teaches mitigating pixilation and inconsonant appearance of a UI element (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to

include Simons' teaching of mitigating pixilation and inconsonant appearance of a UI element in a method for sizing a UI element having at least one component in response to a sizing input to Isreal's teaching of a method for sizing a UI element having at least one component in response to a sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Isreal and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Isreal and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 5:

The modified Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (Isreal: fig. 15).

Claim 6:

The modified Isreal teaches software that requires a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions adapted to perform the method of claim 4 (Isreal: abstract).

Claim 7:

Isreal teaches a GUI that includes a context that a UI element can be rendered to, a method for rendering a UI element having at least one component that is sized in response to sizing input (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Alignment is used as a method for sizing input in response to a request to size the said input. Isreal teaches receiving the sizing input (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches dividing a bitmapped first component into a plurality of grids (col. 7, lines 25 – 35). Isreal teaches adjusting margins of at least some of the grids to size at least some of the grids of the bitmap in response to the sizing input (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). Isreal teaches aligning a second component within the sized first component (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). Isreal teaches rendering the UI element to the context (fig. 15). Israel does not explicitly disclose curbing pixilation and disproportionate representation of a bitmapped component. Simons teaches curbing pixilation and disproportionate representation of a graphical component (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of curbing pixilation and disproportionate representation of a graphical component in a computer system having a GUI including a method for rendering a UI element having at least one component

that is sized in responses to a sizing input to Isreal's teaching of a computer system having a GUI including a method for rendering a UI element having at least one component that is sized in responses to a sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Isreal and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Isreal and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 8:

The modified Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (Isreal: fig. 15).

Claim 42:

Isreal teaches a system adapted to produce a UI element having at least one component (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches a sizing a sizing module adapted to choose a second component of the UI element from a library of second components

(col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches an alignment module adapted to align the chosen second component within a first component of the UI element (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Israel does not explicitly disclose curtailing pixilation and inconsonant depictions of rendered UI elements. Simons teaches curtailing pixilation and inconsonant depictions of rendered UI elements (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of curtailing pixilation and inconsonant depictions of rendered UI elements in a system that produces a UI elements having at least one component in response to sizing input to Isreal's teaching of a system that produces a UI elements having at least one component in response to sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Isreal and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Isreal and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to

mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 43:

The modified Isreal teaches a UI element that is themed (Isreal: fig. 15).

Claim 44:

Isreal teaches a system adapted to produce a UI element having at least one component in response to sizing (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches a sizing module adapted to choose a second component of the UI element from a library of second components (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches an alignment module adapted to align the chosen second component within a first component of the UI element (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Israel does not explicitly disclose attenuating pixilation and incommensurate representation of rendered UI elements. Simons teaches attenuating pixilation and incommensurate representation of rendered UI elements (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of attenuating pixilation and incommensurate representation of rendered UI elements in a system that produces a UI element having at least one component in response to sizing input to Isreal's teaching of a system that produces a UI element having at least one component in response to sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Isreal and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least

two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Isreal and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 45:

The modified Isreal teaches a UI element that is themed (Isreal: fig. 15).

6. Claims 9, 16, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins et al. ("Higgins") in view of Simons et al. ("Simons"), and further in view of Marflak et al. ("Marflak").

Claim 9:

Higgins teaches adapting to size a bitmapped component of a UI element in response to a sizing input, where the bitmapped component was designed under a particular DPI (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins teaches a sizing module adapted to size the bitmapped component in response to the sizing input and based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (col. 4, lines 15 – 35).

Higgins does not explicitly disclose preventing pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component. Simons teaches preventing pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of preventing pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component in a system that sizes a UI element in response to a sizing input to Higgins' teaching of a system that sizes a UI element in response to a sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Higgins and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Higgins and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 16:

Higgins teaches a method for sizing a bitmapped component of a UI element in response to a sizing input, where the bitmapped component was designed under a particular DPI (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins teaches receiving the sizing input (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins teaches sizing the bitmapped component in response to the sizing input and based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins does not explicitly disclose curtailing pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component. Simons teaches curtailing pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of curtailing pixilation and disproportionate appearance of a component in a method for sizing a UI element in response to a sizing input to Higgins' teaching of a method for sizing a UI element in response to a sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Higgins and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2174

to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Higgins and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

Claim 18:

The modified Higgins teaches dividing the bitmap into a plurality of grids (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35). The modified Higgins teaches adjusting the margins of the grids to adjust the size of the grids based upon the functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35).

Claim 22:

Higgins teaches a computer system having a graphical user interface including a context that a UI element have a bitmap component being rendered to, a method for rendering the UI element in response to sizing input where the bitmapped component was designed under a particular DPI (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins teaches receiving sizing input (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins teaches sizing the bitmapped component in response to the sizing input based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component it is designed under (col. 4, lines 15 – 35). Higgins does not explicitly disclose mitigating against disproportionate appearance and pixilation of a UI element. Simons teaches

mitigating against disproportionate appearance and pixilation of a UI element (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of mitigating against disproportionate appearance and pixilation of a UI element in a computer system having a GUI including a method for rendering a UI element in response to sizing input to Higgins' teaching of a computer system having a GUI including a method for rendering a UI element in response to sizing input in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Higgins and Simons still do not explicitly disclose the sizing module capable of sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes. Marflak teaches a system that sizes a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances (figs. 5-7 and 11; col. 2, lines 34-63; col. 3, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Marflak's teaching of a UI element comprising sizing one or more disparate sections of the first component asymmetrically in at least two axes to minimize disproportionate appearances to Higgins and Simons' teaching of a UI element comprising a sizing module that sizes a component in response to a sizing input to mitigate pixilation and disproportionate appearances in order to provide scaling without distortion.

7. Claims 10 – 15, 17, 19 - 21, and 23 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins et al. ("Higgins") in view of Simons et al. ("Simons",

Art Unit: 2174

5,917,549) as applied to claims 9, 16, 18, and 22 above, in view of Isreal, and further in view of Marflak et al. ("Marflak").

Claim 10:

The modified Higgins fails to teach a UI being themed. Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (fig. 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the UI element being themed taught by Isreal with the bitmaps and sizing disclosed by the modified Higgins. Doing so enables the designing of various windows and other UI elements according to specific purposes.

Claim 11:

The modified Higgins fails to teach the sizing module being adapted to divide the bitmapped component into a plurality of grids and adjusting the size of the grids to size the component. Isreal teaches the sizing module being adapted to divide the bitmapped component into a plurality of grids and adjusting the size of the grids to size the component (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the sizing module being adapted to divide the bitmapped component into a plurality of grids and adjusting the size of the grids to size the component taught by Isreal with the bitmaps and sizing disclosed by Higgins. Doing so provides a method for sizing, aligning and positioning output in order to provide a quality presentation.

Claim 12:

The modified Higgins teaches sizing module being adapted to adjust margins of the grids to adjust the size of the grids (Isreal: col. 14, lines 55 – 67).

Claim 13:

The modified Higgins teaches sizing module being adapted to adjust margins of the grids based upon the functional relationship between the DPI between DPI of the context that the UI element is being rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35).

Claim 14:

The modified Higgins teaches sizing modules being adapted to adjust the margins of the grids such that the size of each of the grid share adjusted to both the horizontal and vertical directions (Isreal: col. 14, lines 55 – 67).

Claim 15:

The modified Higgins teaches the functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35).

Claim 17:

The modified Higgins fails to teach a UI being themed. Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (fig. 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the UI element being themed taught by Isreal with the bitmaps and sizing disclosed by Higgins. Doing so enables the designing of various windows and other UI elements according to specific purposes.

Claim 19:

The modified Higgins fails to teach adjusting the margins of the grids such that the size of each of the grids is adjusted in both vertical and horizontal directions. Isreal teaches adjusting the margins of the grids such that the size of each of the grids is adjusted in both vertical and horizontal directions (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine adjusting the margins of the grids such that the size of each of the grids being adjusted in both vertical and horizontal directions taught by Isreal with the bitmaps and sizing disclosed by Higgins. Doing so enables allows for the producing of output within the parameter of its corresponding output peripheral.

Claim 20:

The modified Higgins teaches adjusting the margins of the grids based upon the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35).

Claim 21:

The modified Higgins teaches software that requires a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions adapted to perform the method of claim 20 (abstract).

Claim 23:

The modified Higgins fails to teach a UI being themed. Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (fig. 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the UI element being themed taught by

Isreal with the bitmaps and sizing disclosed by the modified Higgins. Doing so enables the designing of various windows and other UI elements according to specific purposes.

Claim 24:

The modified Higgins teaches adjusting the margins of the grids to adjust the size of the grids based upon the functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35). The modified Higgins fails to teach dividing the bitmap into a plurality of grids. Isreal teaches dividing the bitmap into a plurality of grids (col. 14, lines 55 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine dividing the bitmap into a plurality of grids taught by Isreal with the bitmaps and sizing disclosed by the modified Higgins. Doing so allows for the producing of output within the parameter of its corresponding output peripheral.

Claim 25:

The modified Higgins teaches adjusting the margins of the grids such that the size of each of the grids is adjusted in both vertical and horizontal directions (Isreal: col. 14, lines 55 – 67).

Claim 26:

The modified Higgins teaches adjusting the margins of the grids based upon the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 15 – 35).

8. Claims 27, 28, 32, 36, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isreal et al. ("Isreal") in view of Simons et al. ("Simons").

Claim 27:

Isreal teaches a system adapted to produce a UI element having at least one component (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches a sizing module adapted to choose a second component of the UI element from a library of second components (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches an alignment module adapted to align the chosen second component within a first component of the UI element (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Israel does not explicitly disclose minimizing pixilation and discordant appearance of a component. Simons teaches minimizing pixilation and discordant appearance of a component (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of minimizing pixilation and discordant appearance of a component in a system that produces a UI element having at least one component to Isreal's teaching of a system that produces a UI element having at least one component in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Claim 28:

The modified Isreal teaches the UI element being themed (Isreal: fig. 15).

Claim 32:

Isreal teaches producing a UI element having at least one component (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches choosing a second component of the UI element from a

library of second components (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches aligning the chosen second component within a first component of the UI element (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Israel does not explicitly disclose attenuating pixilation and to ensure consonant appearance of a UI element. Simons teaches attenuating pixilation and to ensure consonant appearance of a UI element (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of attenuating pixilation and to ensure consonant appearance of a UI element in a method for producing a UI element having at least one component to Isreal's teaching of a method for producing a UI element having at least one component in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Claim 36:

The modified Isreal teaches software that requires a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions adapted to perform (Isreal: Abstract).

Claim 38:

Isreal teaches a GUI including a context that a UI element having at least one component can be rendered to, a method for rendering a UI element (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches choosing a second component of the UI element from the library of second components (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). The list described herein is a type of library. Isreal teaches aligning the chosen second component with a first component of the UI element (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Isreal teaches rendering the UI element of the context (col. 15, lines 10 – 25). Israel does not explicitly disclose ensuring minimal

Art Unit: 2174

pixilation and to curtail disproportionate representation. Simons teaches ensuring minimal pixilation and to curtail disproportionate representation (Abstract; col. 1, lines 45-65; col. 2, lines 10-20 and 31-46; col. 3, lines 14-26; col. 3, line 47 through col. 4, line 3; col. 5, lines 35-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Simons' teaching of ensuring minimal pixilation and to curtail disproportionate representation in a computer system having a GUI including a method for rendering a UI element to Isreal's teaching of a computer system having a GUI including a method for rendering a UI element in order to reduce distortion of image content.

Claim 39:

The modified Isreal teaches a UI element that is themed (Isreal: fig. 15).

9. Claims 29 – 31, 33 – 35, 37, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isreal et al. ("Isreal") in view of Simons et al. ("Simons", 5,917,549) as applied to claims 27, 32, and 38 above, and further in view of Higgins et al. ("Higgins").

Claim 29:

The modified Isreal fails to teach entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI, the sizing module adapted to choose the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is being rendered to and the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under. Higgins teaches entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI, the sizing module adapted to choose the second component from the

Art Unit: 2174

library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is being rendered to and the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (col. 4, lines 1 – 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI, the sizing module adapted to choose the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element are rendered to with DPI that the entries within the library were designed under taught by Higgins with the system adapted to produce a UI element having at least one component disclosed by the modified Isreal. Doing so enables adapting output to the parameters of various output peripherals.

Claim 30:

The modified Isreal teaches the sizing module being adapted to choose the second component from the library based upon the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element is being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 1 – 15)

Claim 31:

The modified Isreal teaches the sizing module being further adapted to refine the size of the chosen second component based upon the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library being designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 1 – 15).

Claim 33:

The modified Isreal fails to teach entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI along with choosing the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to and the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under. Higgins teaches entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI (col. 4, lines 1 – 15). Higgins teaches choosing the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to and the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (col. 4, lines 1 – 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI, the sizing module adapted to choose the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element are rendered to with DPI that the entries within the library were designed under taught by Higgins with the system adapted to produce a UI element having at least one component disclosed by the modified Isreal. Doing so enables adapting output to the parameters of various output peripherals.

Claim 34:

The modified Isreal teaches choosing the second component from the library based upon the ratio of the DPI of the element is being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 1 – 15).

Claim 35:

The modified Isreal teaches refining the size of the chosen second component based upon the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element is rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 1 – 15).

Claim 37:

The modified Isreal teaches software that requires a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions adapted to perform (Isreal: Abstract).

Claim 40:

The modified Isreal fails to teach entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI along with choosing the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under. Higgins teaches entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI (col. 4, lines 1 – 15). Higgins teaches choosing the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (col. 4, lines 1 – 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the entries within the library being designed under a particular DPI along with choosing the second component from the library based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under taught by Higgins with the system adapted to produce a UI element having at least one component disclosed by

the modified Isreal. Doing so enables adapting output to the parameters of various output peripherals.

Claim 41:

The modified Isreal teaches choosing the second component from the library based upon the ratio of the DPI of the context that the UI element being rendered to the DPI that the entries within the library were designed under (Higgins: col. 4, lines 1 – 15).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, except for the following:

Applicant argued the following:

(a) In regards to claims 27, 28, 32, 36, 38 and 39, the secondary document fails to teach or suggest "sizing one or more disparate sections...asymmetrically".

(b) The indicated passage does not disclose choosing a second component of the UI element from a library of second components.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "sizing one or more disparate sections...asymmetrically") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Per (b), the modified Isreal does teach choosing a second component of the UI element from a list/library of second components (Isreal: col. 15, lines 10-25). If by "library" applicant meant a collection of routines, applicant is invited to amend the claim to reflect such meaning.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Merrill (US 6,614,432 B1) teach an image rendering technique.

Inquires

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
September 29, 2005

Kristine Lincaid
KRISTINE LINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100